The Sunlamp ANPRM -Summary of Comments and Data

W. Howard Cyr and the CDRH Working Group on Sunlamps

Objectives

- · Explain the process of rulemaking
- · why did we publish the ANPRM?
- Did we get answers to our concerns?
- Is data sufficient for us to publish a proposed rule?

Why did we publish the ANPRM

- · Reports of a melanoma "epidemic"
- · Reports of a melanoma-sunlamp link
- Report of an action spectrum showing that UVA was more efficient in producing melanoma than in producing crythema
- All caused great concern in scientific/medical community

The "process" of rulemaking

- Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPRM)
- Proposed Rule
- Final Rule
- scientific evaluation
- advice from TEPRSSC
- address responses to Proposed Rule

Response to the ANPRM

- · 27 submissions
 - indoor tanning industry (4)
 - lamp manufacturers (8)
 - dermatology organizations (2)
 - academia (3)
 - salon owners (4)
 - State and County regulatory agencies (5)
 - Insurance company (1)

Biological basis for standards

- Agreement that Phototype I should not get exposed to UV
- Disagree on Phototype II
 - dermatologists phototype II can burn easily
 - indoor tanning industry phototype II can tan, but must be careful - 2 subtypes
- Agreement that all should avoid "burning" doses

Biological Basis for Standards 2

- Agreement that tanning is photoprotective
 disagreement over degree of protection
- Major disagreements over other "benefits" from "tanning" doses
 - role of vitamin D is important
 - dosage need to produce adequate vitamin D is major consideration

Exposures schedules

- Did not get any exposure schedule based on skin cancer risks
- · should be expanded to other phototypes
- Got new data on current FDA exposure schedule
 - does not lead to burns
 - individuals don't tan until 6 8 session

Training

- No disagreement all emphasized importance of training
 - Important to inform customers, particularly about drug interactions ~ C26-Amy Leslie
 - A trained operator should cover the topics in FDA's warning label with first-time tanners C17-ST
 - Salons are an excellent place for educational materials, can take them home – C15-DS

Melanoma warning

- melanoma-sunlamp link lacks rigorous scientific proof (ANPRM comments, meetings, recent reviews)
- some studies show positive association, others negative, and others no association
- Only one disagreement with proposal to require warning statements in catologs, specification sheets, and brochures

Informed Consent

- Agreement on value of informed consent statements
- Efforts underway by indoor tanning industry to require written consent statements for young clients

Other comments

- Timers separate the timer from the emergency shut-off switch
- Eyewear "if you see light, change eye protection"
- · make requirements for sanitary pillows

Efficacy ratings for bulbs

- · Agreement that a rating system is needed
- Suggestion that the UV index be used as part of the rating system
- Disagreement as to whether only testing of lamps is needed, or testing of whole sunlamp systems (booths) (beds)

Re-certification

- Anyone who changes specification of lamps becomes a manufacturer
- Many comments that this requirement be strong. Concerns about insurance coverage

No plans to ban sunlamps

- the melanoma-sunlamp connection is not well established
- · individual choice
- risks are fairly well understood by public

Three ways to deal with "melanoma" warning

- A specific melanoma warning err on the side of public health
- No specific melanoma warning data is inconclusive
- IEC warning -
 - skin cancer (sometimes fatal)

The future

- Continue to evaluate data and comments from the ANPRM
- Work with those who responded to ANPRM - clarifications and additional data
- FDA and industry work with consensus standards organizations, e.g., IEC

The future 2

- monitor current research, including CDRH studies
- Brief indoor tanning industry -Nov/Chicago
- · Draft proposed rules after full evaluation
- brief TEPRSSC
- · publish proposed rule